G. R. S. 59]

Mus 1-35-57

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1904
(Mudgrai)

File No. 22

Serial Nos. 1-14.

Papers Filed.

Month September 1906.

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Varadachar, Archik of Doss Venkataramana Swami temple in Bangalore City regarding the mismanagement of the Endowment of the temple

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

Mus 17-31-1-13

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT:—

In re the complaint of Varadachar, Archak of Lal Doss Sri Venkataramana swami temple in Bangalore City, regarding the mismanagement of the endowment of the temple.

LAST REFERENCE.

Letter No. 383 dated 2nd ~~November 1903~~ September 1904 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

The Lal Doss Sri Venkataramana swami temple in Bangalore City is a Muzrai Institution endowed with the marginally noted cash and land grants.

	A	G	Assessment
Swi. 20 118. Dry.	2. 25.	2-0-0	in Kodasthalli, Bangalore Taluk.
Wet.	0-7.	0-12-0	
118 Total	0-28	4-0-0	

Ready money cash grant of Rs. 1-7-3 per mensem

A In his petition No. 1948 dated 25th May 1903, Varadachar, Archak of the temple represented that the late Damodara Doss Sait spent large sums of money towards improving the temple and conducting services therein, and that house No. 491 with its shops etc which belonged to the Sait had been given to the

temple in view to the rent realized thereon being utilized for services in the temple. He further stated that the affairs of the Institution were being mismanaged by the late Bhavan Lahiji, Gumasta of Damodara Doss. He stated that one Veerabhadrappa had applied for license to erect a building on the site, (the house referred to by the Petitioner as belonging to the temple having fallen down) and requested that as it belonged to the temple, permission should not be granted. Thereupon, the Deputy Commissioner was requested to report upon the allegation of the Petitioner and he was informed that pending final orders of Government, the Municipal authorities should be asked not to issue any license. The Deputy Commissioner has now submitted the report with Dr. Palpu's (the Vice President) minute and states "It is evident that the site in dispute was the private property of Damodara Doss Sait and that the temple has no sort of right over it". But from the records it is observed that the late Damodara Doss Sait was the original owner of the

B

house in question which was purchased by him in 1833. From the copy of the deposition of Gokuldass (ગોકુળદાસ) before the Taluka Amildar given on the 9th September 1881, it is observed that Bhavan Sahuji was misappropriating the temple endowments, especially the rent derived from the house in question and that therefore one Narasimhanja was appointed trustee of the charities. In the deposition it is stated that the house which had been gifted to the temple in view to the rent thereof being used for temple purposes, was being used by the Sahuji as his residence. And, in the judgment in appeal Nos 90 of 1899-00, in the Chief Court of Mysore it is observed that "the house belonged to Damodara Dass Sait and that Sahuji was permitted to live therein as his agent.

Submitted ~~[illegible]~~

The records are incomplete.

RS
26/11/03

Submitted with a draft

RS
14/1/04

Note cont'd —

In this office docket no 2036 of 18th January 1904, the Advocate was

requested (1) to obtain & forward the sale deed executed by Venkatarao & Mahalakshmibaji in favour of Veerabhadrappa, (2) to obtain & forward a copy of the Power of Attorney in favour of one Narasimiah executed by Gokuldass son-in-law of the late Damodara Dass Sait, (3) to obtain & forward the accounts maintained by Bhavan Sahuji and Narasimhaiya, (4) to report why the Archak of the temple did not report the action of the Plague authorities in demolishing the house & ~~to~~ (5) to enquire & report what Krishna Dass, a descendant of the late Damodra Dass Sait has to say in the matter.

With refce to the above the Dy Comm.r ~~[illegible]~~ forwards (1) the sale deed and (2) the power of attorney, & reports that (3) the whereabouts of Bhusavaji are not known & that Narasimhaiya has not kept any accounts as he was not put in charge

charge of the temple, (4) that the Archak did not report because he thought that Bhusavaji would do so and (5) Krishna Doas ~~is~~ has stated that he knows nothing in the matter.

In the sale deed no mention is made of the house in question as having belonged to the temple. It is merely stated that the house belonging to the estate of the late Damodara Doas Sait & which was in the management of Bhusavaji, Agent of the Estates, is sold to Veerabhadrappa for Rs 2,200/- This deed has been executed on the 22nd June 1896.

In the power of Attorney it is stated that the management of the temple at Balepet & houses nos 26, 23 & 28 in Chickapet should rest in Narasimhaiya,

This was executed under date 30th Jany 1879.

Submitted 26/9/04

Now the point for decision is whether under the circumstances set forth, the house in question can be treated as a temple property.

25/9/04

~~As the~~ The Chief Court has already decided that the house was the private property of Damodar Das Seth. There is nothing else to show that it is temple property.

This may be communicated to the Petn and to the Municipal Authorities.

Vencata Sama Rao
2/11/04

Submd to the Dewan through the 2nd C/R
4/11

151
4/11/04

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

517
25/5/03

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 25.5.2003
REG. No. 1951
MUZRAI BRANCH

25/5/03

[illegible]

2. [illegible]

3. [illegible]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No of 190

Answer in no the property of the Devo. No fresh case urged for a consideration of the order already passed. Petition may be rejected

S. Ramachandra
10/4/

12/4/05 Yes Please see Sec 5 of the C Code - If the Petrs advised to proceed under the Section the Dy Comr may on application consider the granting of the required under that S

6431 6.5.05 [illegible]

5904/11.4.05

[illegible]

The latter part of the Dewan's remarks need not go into the Endt
4/6/05

Recd
9/5/05

517
25/5/03

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 25-5-03
REG. No. 1957
MUZRAI BRANCH

[illegible]

3. [illegible]

[illegible]

4. [illegible]

[illegible]

5. [illegible]

[illegible]

6- [illegible]

7- [illegible]

8- [illegible]

MUZRAI

19 —1903

From

DEPUTY SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore D.t.

Dated } 28th May 1903.
Despatched
Received

General No. 2369 & 2370
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. 2

Ref. no. ~~2618~~ 1948 dy 28.4.03
— 1957 dy 25.5.03

In forwarding herewith the marginally noted two petitions from Archak Varadachar of Laldous Sri Venkataramanaswamy temple in Bangalore City, complaining against the mismanagement of the endowments of the temple by one Basappa

has the honor to request that a detailed report as to the present state of the temple, its management and its properties &c, may be submitted for orders of Govt at an early date.

2. The Dy Commr is requested to ask the municipal authorities not to issue a license to any particular individual to erect a building on the land which is alleged to belong to the temple, before final orders are passed by Govt

By order

28/5/03

28/5/03

Dy Sec

To Encl. [illegible]

1903/04 863

From The Dy Commnr's Secy Bangalore Dt

To The Dy Secy to the Govt of Mysore Mysore Dept

Dated 30th
Despatched 2nd } Oct 1903 Nov 1903
Received

General No.

S. No. 383.

Enclosure No 10 a file

528.

Recd 4/11/03

Submitted with a note

Dy Secy's docket No. 2369 of 28th May 1903.

Submits representation the petition of Archuk Varadachar of Lal dass Sri Venkataramanaswami temple in Bangalore City complaining of the mismanagement of the endowments of the temple by one Basappa

S No. 383
Inwards

Bangalore District
Deputy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 30th October 1903.

From,

H. H. Sharkey Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To,

L Ananta Ramiah Esqr B.A.
Dy Secy to the Govt of Mysore
Muzrai Deptt

Sir,

With reference to your docket No 2369 dated 28th May 1903, forwarding for report two petitions from Archak Varadachar of Laldas Venkataramana Swami temple in the Bangalore City, I have the honor to state that the temple is a Muzrai Institution enjoying a ready money monthly grant of Rs 1-7-3 and also

Name of the village	Survey No.	Extent and Assessment
Kodigehalli in the Bangalore Taluk	118 dry	2. 15
	wet	" — 7
	115 wet	" — 28
		2 —
		" — 12 —
		" —

also the marginally noted Inam lands. It is reported that worship is being daily performed.

2. One Veerabhadrappa applied for licence to build a house on certain vacant site in Chikkpet, said to have been purchased by him from the legal representatives of Damodaradas Set, the original owner of the same. But archak Varadachari objected to the grant of any licence, alleging that the site in question belonged to Laldas Venkataramana Swami temple, a sunnyrai institution. The Amildar after enquiry reports that Damodara das Set purchased the house in 1833, but there is no documentary evidence of any kind to prove that the site in question was ever endowed to the temple, as alleged by

by Varadachary. But it is said that the rents recovered from the house and certain shops which were then standing on the site in dispute were being utilized towards the expenses of the temple and one Krishnadas, a descendant of Damodaradas Set is even now sending every month from Madras Rs 20/- to be disbursed as detailed in the margin. From the enquiries held by the Amildar and the evidence adduced on both sides, it is evident that the site in dispute was the private property of Damodaradas Set and that the temple has no sort of a right over it.'

Archak of Venkataramanasamy — Rs-8-0
Dry fruits — 7-0-0
Garden — 6-0-0

3. Copy of the memo of the Vice President, regarding the issue of license

is

is also submitted for reference.

4. The entire Vernacular records bearing on the subject, together with the petitions received with the above is submitted for reference and return when no longer required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient Servant,

[illegible] Sparks

Dy Commr Sindh

[illegible]

Memo

Basappa Sahujee, his wife Laksum Bayee and Varadachar submitted petitions bringing to notice that one Gowdem Veerabhadrappa intends applying for a licence to build on house Site No. 1291 in Taluk Cutcherry Road and requesting that his application may be rejected as he has no right to the Site. Laksam Bayee, one of the three Jakvardars above referred to, applied for a licence to build a house on the same Site. Veerabhadrappa's application for licence was subsequently received. Basappa Sahujee has since withdrawn his protest against Veerabhadrappa's claim. The other Jakvardars were served with notices to produce documents to prove their right

to

to the site. Meanwhile, Takrar petitions from Eswara Sahujee and Krishna Sastri against Veerabhadrappa being permitted to build were also received. These were also given notice to appear with documents to substantiate their takrars.

Mr V. N. Narasimmayar, Advocate appeared on behalf of Veerabhadrappa and Mr Gangadariah, Pleader, on behalf of Laksam Bayi. The other parties were present in person. The advocates argued their cases at great length and other parties were heard. The documents produced were seen and the following conclusions were arrived at.

(1) With regard to the takrar of Basappa Sahujee, son of Bavan Sahujee, Agent of Damodar Das Sait (deceased) owner of the above house, he has withdrawn his

his takrar.

(2) Laksam Bayee, wife of the above Basappa Shahuje stated that her father in law Bavan Sahuje as the Agent of the Damodar das sanj, owner of the site was in possession of the house and that she was living in the house before its demolition by the Plague Department. She has no documents to show that the house belongs to her and her husband. Basappa Sahuje has withdrawn his protest against Veerabhadrappa, being permitted to build thereon. Vide para 1. Besides, it has been decided by the Sub. Judge and Chief Court that her father in law Bavan Sahuji through whom she bases her claim, was not the owner and that his heirs had no right to dispose of the property belonging to the late

late Damodardas Sait. Consequently, his takrar and his application for license could not be accepted.

(3) Varada Achary Archak of Laldas Venkataramanaswami temple stated that the house belongs to the temple and that the owner Damodardas Sait was paying whole or part of the realization from this property for the expenses thereof. No documents were produced to show that the property was made over to the temple. The mere fact that part or whole of the rent realized from the buildings was being paid towards the temple expenses could not be considered sufficient to establish the claim set forth by him. His takrar therefore has to be rejected

(4) The takrar of Eswara Saluiga cannot be admitted as the house in question has

has been hypothecated to him by Basappa Sahujee who has no right to it. Vide paras 1 and 2. Besides Basappa Sahujee has himself withdrawn his takrar.

(5) Krishna Sastri stated that 1/4th part of the house with possession has been mortgaged to him by Bavan Sahujee. But this Bavan Sahujee was only an agent and as per Chief Court decision, had no right over the property.

(6). Veerabhadrappa, the 2nd applicant for license produces registered documents executed by the representatives of the owner, the late Damodardas Sait. and he is also in possession of the original sale deed ( ) executed in favor of Damodar Das Sait and also produces orders of the Chief Court to prove that the house belongs to late Damodar das Sait.

Consequently.

Consequently Veerabhadrappa may be permitted to build and granted a license on condition that the license given to him does not prejudice th if any.

4 The site is in the main Street (Chikapete) and it is at present used as a latrine by the public. Under section 151 of Municipal Regulation, if the President fails to signify his approval or otherwise of the plan within one month after the application for license is made, the parties may proceed with the work without President's permission. Orders are therefore solicited as to whether license may be granted as above to Veerabhadrappa or delayed pending orders of the Deputy Commissioner in the Muzrai Department who has directed

on

on a mahazar presented by Mr Gangadariah Pleader on behalf of the temple on the 21st May 1903 that the issue of license should be kept in abeyance pending orders from his Court.

25/5/1903 (Sd). P. Pathi

"Copy"

[illegible]
Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District
[illegible]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT. 314

19 —19

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
DEPUTY SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy Commr
Bangalore District

Dated
Despatched 18th January 1904
Received
General No. 2036
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. one file

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter no 383 dated 2nd November 1903, reporting on the petition of Anchak' Varadachar of the Lal Bag Venkataramanaswami temple in the Bangalore city, complaining of the alleged mismanagement of the temple by one Basappa —

The chief point of complaint appears to ~~be~~ relate to the ownership of the site No 491 situated in the Sulak Catchery Road. The site in question is claimed by one Veerabhadrappa, who alleges to have purchased the house standing thereon in 1896, from Maha Lakshmi Bai and Venkata Rao, both residing at Madras, but it is contended by the petitioner Varadachar, who is the Archak of the Sri Lal Das Venkatanarasimha Temple, that the house and a few shops attached thereto, as ~~to~~ ~~was~~ well as some of the rooms constructed within the temple premises, all of which had belonged to Damodara Das Sait, were set apart by

by him for the use of the temple and as such, the said Veera-bhadrappa had no right to the site under dispute. The sale deed executed by Venkat Rao and Mahalakshmibaiji in favour of Veerabhadrappa has not been produced. This should be obtained and forwarded.

3. Gokulo Das, son-in-law of the late Damodara Das Seth, in his written statement of the 9th September 1881 alleged that, as the sole surviving heir of the late Damodara Das Seth, he had given a Power of Attorney to one Narasimhappa, entrusting to him the management of the temple and its endowments, together with the house in question, with the express condition of maintaining the

~~Kaarde~~ institution in good order, out of the income derived from the endowments. In the statement he even ~~[illegible]~~ expressed his desire to hand over the management to Government. A copy of the Power of Attorney, if available, should also be obtained and forwarded.

4. The examination of the temple accounts maintained by Bhawan Sahuji during the period when he was in charge of the temple and its endowments as the Agent of Damodara Das as well as those maintained by Narasimhaiya on behalf of Gokula Das, during his Agentship should also be ~~[illegible]~~ obtained and forwarded, after being duly checked by the Dy Commr to see if the rents payable on the house and the shops were ~~[illegible]~~ actually being utilized towards the benefit of the temple, as alleged by the Archaka Varadachar

5. It is also a point for investigation, if, as alleged by the petitioner, the rents were being utilized for the maintenance of the temple, and if ~~the~~ the were quite sure that the house de had been set apart by Damodara Das sist for its exclusive use ~~for the use of the temple~~, why no steps were taken by him to report to the Assistant, as the local Magistrate Officer, at the time when the Bhopal authorities demolished the house and thereby caused the income of the temple to ~~suffer~~ -

6. One Krishna Das, a descendant of the late Damodara Das sist is even now said to have been remitting a sum of Rs 20 a month to meet the charges of the temple establishment. What he may have to say in regard to the dispute, and his present and local Agent should also be enquired into and reported upon.

The enclosures are returned, as requested and I have de

Re-submission -

14/1/04

Sd/-

14/1/04

Dy Secretary

1904. 03 85

From The Dy Commissioner Bangalore Dt

To The Secy to the Govt of Mysore Mujrai Deptt

Dated 2nd Sept 1904.

Despatched

Received

General No.

M.S. No.

Enclosure No. 5

MYSORE GOVERNMENT 917 MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

Mr. please continue the note & submit for order.

3/9/04 [illegible]

Note cont'd & submitted

5/9/04

Mujr Secy's No 2036 of 16th January 1904

Submits further report in regard to Site No 491 situated in the Taluk Cutcherry road Bangalore City

M.S. No. 16
Cumine file

Bangalore 2? September 1904

From
D. Devaraj Urs Esquire
Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore Distt.

To
L. Anantasami Rao Esquire B.A.
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Mazrai Deptt.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No-2036 dated 16th January 1904, calling for further details regarding the vacant site in the Taluk cutchery road, I have the honor to forward, herewith, the sale deed executed by Venkata Rao and Mahalakshmi bai in favor of Veerabhadrappa and also the power of attorney referred to in paras 2 and 3 of the above letter.

2. Notices have been issued by the Amildar to Bhusavaji alias Basappa son of Bhavan Savaji and Narasimiah for producing the temple accounts kept by them. It is reported

that the whereabouts of the former are not known and the latter has deposed that he was not put in charge of the temple, nor has he kept any accounts

3 Archak Varodachar has deposed that he did not report the matter to the Amildar when the plague authorities demolished the building, in the belief that Bhavani Savaji would intimate the same to the Amildar

4. Notices were issued to Krishnadass and his Agent as to what they have to say with regard to the site in dispute. The former has not replied and the latter states that he knows nothing in the matter.

5. The vernacular papers received with the above, together with the Amildar's report No. 4 dated 10 July 1904 are herewith submitted for reference.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Read:

Petition No. 1951 dated 25th May 1903 from Varadachar, archak of the Sri Lal Dass Venkataramana Swami temple in the Bangalore City objecting to the grant of the licence applied for by one Veerabhadrappa to build a house on a certain vacant site in Chikkapet said to have been purchased by him from the legal representative of Damodar Dass Sett, on the ground that the site in question had been endowed to the temple by Damodar Dass Sett.

And,

Correspondence ending with letter No. M.S. 16 dated

2nd September 1904 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, reporting on the above.

Order thereon: No.

2302-3 D/19/12/04
L. file

The petitioner states that on the site in question, a house and two shops had stood and that the rent realized therefrom was being utilized for certain services in the temple, but that the buildings had been demolished by the plague authorities. The Deputy Commissioner, ~~has given~~ ~~reports~~ states that there ~~are~~ is no documentary evidence to show that the buildings had been granted to the institution

when one Veeral who had purchased the ~~on~~ which stood on the site referred to applied to the authorities for a license to a building thereon, objected to the grant of the lic on the ground that the site to the Lal Doos Venkatar-swami temple in Bangalore

|| A report having been called for the,

by Damodara Dass ~~Sett.~~ Sett. Further, from the records submitted it is observed that the Chief Court has decided that the house ~~st~~ and shops were the private property of Damodara Dass Sett.

2. In these circumstances the Government ~~see~~ are of opinion that there are no grounds for considering ~~is nothing else to show~~ that the site in question belongs to the temple as alleged by the petitioner. His petition is accordingly rejected.

(Decision order)

14/12/04
Secretary
Revs: Depts

To

The Deputy Comr, Bangalore
Dt-retg records
President, Bangalore City Municipality

Endt-Hopetr

No. 2

ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರಿಗೆ
ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡಲು ಇಷ್ಟು ಲಂಚವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು

ಪೌರಸಭೆಗಳು ಮಾಡಿದ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಪೌರಸಭೆಗಳ
ಆಡಳಿತದ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಭರಿಸುವುದು —

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸೇವೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಭರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ

[illegible]

[illegible] GOVERNMENT
3498
[illegible]

21/3/05

Rupees

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

118

నెం. 3614

తే 31.3.[illegible]

పౌరసరఫరాల శాఖ మంత్రి గారికి

రవాణా శాఖ మంత్రి గారి ద్వారా

ఉప ముఖ్యమంత్రి గారికి

గౌరవనీయులు మంత్రి వర్యులకు

యువజన సంఘ నిర్మాణ వీరభద్ర

ప్రసాద్ గారి -

యువతా!

నిరుద్యోగులు నిరుద్యోగ భృతి

కొరకు మరియు జీవనోపాధి కొరకు 3498

కోట్ల రూపాయలు అప్పులు తీసుకుని

ఉన్నారు -

~~అనర్హులకు మంజూరు~~ గౌరవ

మంత్రి వర్యులకు నా విన్నపం

నిరుద్యోగ భృతి పథకం ద్వారా అర్హులు

~~కాని వారికి~~ ~~మంజూరు~~

~~చేయగలరు~~

~~అనర్హులకు మంజూరు చేయగలరు~~

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1904

2302-3

[illegible]

By order

[illegible] 30/3/05

[illegible]

25/3/05

[illegible]

819

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.
Mysore 29th March 1905.

Papers No. 2338
31/3/05



Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Inspector Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

No. 1675 & 074·05

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

[illegible] ಸ್ಥಾನದ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿಂದಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ [illegible] ಸಾಹುಜಿ ಸಾಹೇಬರ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ.

[illegible] ಶ್ರೀವೆಂಕಟರಮಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ [illegible] ಹತ್ತೊಂಬತ್ತನೆ ಶತಮಾನಗಳ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು.

1. ಮದರಾಸ್ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಾಲ್‌ದಾಸ್ [illegible] ಎಂಬ ಒಬ್ಬ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಾಹುಕಾರನು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ವರ್ತಕ ತನಕ್ಕಾಗಿ [illegible] ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಜನರು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾಗಿ ನೆಲೆಗೆ ಇರುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೇವಾಲಯವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಂಗ್ರಹದೇವರನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಶಿವಲಿಂಗವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಈ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಜೀರ್ಣೋದ್ಧಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುವ್ವಿನತೆಯಿಟ್ಟ ಭಾವಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದರು.

2. ಈಚೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನರಳದ ದಾಪೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟ್ ಎಂಬುವರು ಈ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಉಭಯ ಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳ [illegible] ಪಡಿತರ ದೀಪಾರಾಧನೆ ಅರ್ಚಕರ ವೇತನ ತೋಟದ ಆಳಿನ ತಲಬು ಮತ್ತು [illegible] ನಡೆಯುವದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪೇಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಬಜಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಿಂದ ಮಾಹೆಯಾನಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದ 40 ರೂ ಪಾಮಿಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಇಂದಾ ಮೇಲಿನ ಧರ್ಮಕಾರ್ಯ ನೆರವೇರಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದೆಂತ ನಿಷ್ಕೈಗಾಸಿ ಆ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜುಮೆಂಟು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೇಮಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಭವಾಕ್‌ಸಾಹುಜಿಯೆಂಬ ವರಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪಡಿಸಿ, ಉದ್ದೇಶ್ಯಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆಕಟ್ಟುಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದರಂತೆ ಬಹುಕಾಲ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಲಾಲ್‌ದಾಸ್ ವೆಂಕಟರಮಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನವೆಂದು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುತ್ತೆ.

3. ಈಚೆಗೆ ಸದರಿ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರಾದ ಭವಾಕ್ ಸಾಹುಜಿಯು ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನದಿಸದೆ ದುರಾಲೋಚನೆಯಿಂದಾ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ಅಪಹರಿಸಲು ಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸಂಗತಿ ದಾಪೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟರ ವಾರಸ್ದಾರರಾದ ಗೋಕುಲದಾಸ್ ಗೋಪರ್ಧನದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟರವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದು ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಫಿರ್ಯಾದುಮಾಡಿ ಬೇರೆ [illegible] ರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ವ್ಯವಹರಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ, ವಿಷಯ ತಿರ್ಮಾನದೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಮೃತಪಟ್ಟರು

4. ಈಚೆಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವರುಷಗಳು ದೇವರ ಕೇವೆಗಳು ನಿಂತು ಬಂತಲ್ಲದೆ ಭವಾಕ್ ಸಾಹುಜಿಯು ಮೃತಪಟ್ಟನು. ಆತನ ಮಗ ಭೋಗಸಾಹುಜಿ, ಪುರಫ್ ಬಸವ ಸಾವಜಿಯೆಂಬುವನುಸದರಿ ದೇವರಸ್ವತ್ತನ್ನ ಕ್ರಯ ಭೋಗ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನುಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟು ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಭೋಗ್ಯವನ್ನುಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಖರೀದಿಯನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿದನು. ಈಪ್ರಮೇಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಂದಿಗೆ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಗೌಡರವೀರಭದ್ರಪ್ಪ ಎಂಬಾತನು ಈಭಾರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತನ್ನು ತಾನುಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬಆಶೋತ್ತರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮದ್ರಾಸಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಮಹಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿಬಾಯಿಯವರ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತೆ ವೆಂಕಟರಾವ್‌ಯಂಬುವರನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಸದರಿವೆಂಕಟರಾವ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮಹಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಬಾಯಿಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ ವಿಲ್‌ಯಾನೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ನಂಬಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ವ್ರಯಿಲ್

ಆಧಾರದ ಮ್ಯಾಲೆ ಸದರಿ ಮಹಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿಬಾಯಿ ವೆಂಕಟರಾವ್ ಇವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್‌ಶೇಟರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ 5 ಲಕ್ಷರೂಪಾಯಿ ತಮಗೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂತಲೂ ತಾವೇ ವಾರಸ್‌ದಾರರೆಂತಲೂ ತಂದೆ ಫಿರ್ಯಾದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಬಗ್ಯೆ ನೇಮಿಸಿದ್ದ ಮೈಸೂರು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್‌ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ—$\frac{6 \text{ ಮತ್ತು } 8 \text{ ನೆ}}{1896 \text{ ನೆ ಇಸವಿ}}$—ನಂಬರು ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆ ನಡಿಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗಲೇ (ಆಗ್ಯೆ ಸುಮಾರು 8 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬೆಲೆಬಾಳತಕ್ಕದಾಗಿದ್ದು ಹಾಲಿಬೈಲಜಾಗ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸುಮಾರು 5 ಸಾವಿರರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬೆಲೆ ಬಾಳತಕ್ಕ) ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಯ 2ನೇ ಪ್ಯಾರಾದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗುವ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸ್ವತ್ತನ್ನು ಜುಜುವಿ 2,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕ್ರಯಕ್ಕೆ ಪಡೆದನು. ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ಭವಾನಿಸಾಹುಜಿಯವರು ಹಂಡತಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದದ್ದರಿಂದಾ ಈವೈಕಿ ಒಬ್ಬನಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಭೂಸಾಹುಜಿ ಪುರಫ್ ಬಸಪ್ಪಯಂಬ, ಬದ್ದಜಾಲ್ (ಈತನ ತಾಯಿಯಂದಲೆ ಹೇಳಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ) ಹುಡುಗನನ್ನು ಪೊಳಪದಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು 3,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಆ ಹುಡುಗನಿಗೆ ಆಶೆ ತೋರಿಸಿ ರಿಲೀಜ್‌ಬಾಂಡು ಬರಿಸಿ ಆಗ್ಯೆ 1,500 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಈಚೆಗೆ 1,500 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಆತನಿಂದ ಒಂದು ರಸೀತಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡನು.

5. ಆದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನವಾಗದೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದು. ಅಷ್ಟರಲ್ಲೇ ಪ್ಲೇಗ್‌ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಮನೆಯು ಪ್ಲೇಗ್‌ರೂಲ್ಸುಪ್ರಕಾರಗೆ ಪಡದುಹಾಕಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿತು. ಈ ಪಡದುಹಾಕಿದ ಖಾಲಿ ಜಾಗಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸದರಿ ಗೌಡರವೀರಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಲೈಸನ್‌ಸಬಗ್ಯೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಶಿಟಿಮ್ಯುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೂ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಡೆಪ್ಯೂಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರವರಿಗೂ ಅರ್ಜಿಕೊಟ್ಟರು ಆಸಂಗತಿಯು ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿದು ಆ ಕೊಡ್ಲಿಯ ಮ್ಯುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೂ, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ಕಮಿಷನರ್‌ಸಾಹೇಬರವರಿಗೂ, ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಯಿಲಾಖೆಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿಗೂ ಸಹಾ ನಾವುಗಳು ಅರ್ಜಿಕೊಟ್ಟೆವು. ಇದರಮ್ಯಾಲೆ ಲೈಸನ್‌ಸ್ ಕೊಡುವದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರು.

6. ಹಾಲಿ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ದಾರರವರಿಂದಾ 16—1---1905 ನೇ ಮಕ್ಕುಂಮಿನ 40 ನೇ ನಂಬರು ಯಿಂಡಾರ್ಸು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂಪದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿಗೂ, ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೂ, ಫಿರ್ಯಾದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಮೇಲೆ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡುಮಾಡದು ಆಜ್ಞೆಗೆ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಯಿಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ ಸಾದರಾಗಿರುವ 2,302 ನೇ ನಂಬರಿನ ಆರ್ಡರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಜಾಗಾ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲು ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ದಾಖಲೆಗಳು ಇರುವದಿಲ್ಲವಾಗಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಪಜಾಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೆ, ಎಂದು ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ.

ಈ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಘನಹೊಂದಿದ ಪ್ರಭುಗಳವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಅಪ್ಪೀಲ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಈಕೆಳಗೆ ನಮೂದಾಗುವ ಕಾರಣಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ

(a) ಚರ್ಚಾಸ್ಪದವಾದ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್‌ಶೇಟರವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದೆಂಬುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ದಾಖಲೆಗಳು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮತ್ತು. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಶಿಟಿ ಮ್ಯುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ.

(b) ಈ ಸ್ವತ್ತುಗಳಿಂದಾ ಬರುವ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ವಗೈರೆ ಹುಟ್ಟುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರಾಗಿನೇಮಿಸಿ ಇರುವ ಭವಾನಿಸಾಹುಜಿಯು ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವನಾಗಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಆತನನ್ನು ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜುಮೆಂಟಿನಿಂದಾ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಬೇರೆ ಮೊಕರೂರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂತಲೂ ಈ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನಹುಟ್ಟುವಳಿ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂತಲೂ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸೇಟರವರ ವಾರಸ್ದಾರ್ರು ಗೋಕುಲದಾಸ್ ಯಂಬುವರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುನಲ್ಲಿ 1881. ನೇ ಯಿಸವಿ ಸೆಪ್ಟಂಬರು ತಾರೀಖು 9 ರಲ್ಲು. ಅಮಲ್ದಾರರವರ ರೂಬುರೂಬು ಕೈಫೀಯತ್ತುಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳದಿರುವ ಅನೇಕ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡುಗಳಿಂದಾ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಖರ್ಚಿಗಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ಈಡಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದೆಂತ ದೃಢಪಡುತ್ತೆ.

(c) ಮೈಸೂರ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದಾ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್‌ಶೇಟರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾದ ದ್ರವ್ಯವನ್ನು ಅವರವಾರ್ಸುದಾರ್ರಮೇಲೆ ಮಹಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ವೆಂಕಟರಾವ್ ಯವರು ತಂದೆಫಿರ್ಯಾದ್ ಮೈಸೂರು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟುನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಟೊಯವರು ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್‌ಶೇಟ

ರವರಿಗೆ ವಾರಸ್ಸುದಾರರಲ್ಲವೆಂತಲೂ ಆ ಕೇಸುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಲ್‌ಗಳು ಪೂರ್ಜಿತವಾಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲವೆಂತಲೂ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಜಾಮಾಡಿ ಅಕ್ಸ್ಟ್ರಾಲ್ ಪ್ರಾಪರ್ಟಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ದಾಖಲ್ಮಾದಿಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದಾ ಸದರಿ ಮಹಲ ಪ್ರಿಬಾಯಿ ವೆಂಕಯಮ್ಮ ಯವರಿಂದಾ ಗೌಡವೀರಬದ್ರಪ್ಪನೆಂಬುವರಿಗೆ ಆಗಿರುವ ಖರೀದಿಯು ಮತ್ತು ಭವಾನ್‌ಸಂಹುಜಿ ಮಗ, ಭೂ ಸಾಹುಜಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬಸವಸಾಹುಜಿಯೆಂಬುವನಿಂದ ವಿಲೀಕುಖಾಂದು ಹುಟ್ಟಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವದು ಸಹಾ ಯೇನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾದವುಗಳಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದುತ್ತೆ.

(d) ಸದರಿ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟರಿಗೆ ವಾರಸ್ಸುದಾರರು ಯಾರೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂಬದಾಗಿ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದಾ ಫೈಸಲಾದಮೇಲೆ ಸದರಿ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟರವರದಾಗಿದ್ದ ಕುಣಿಗಲ್ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಹುಲಿಯೂರು ದುರ್ಗದ ಸಮ್ಮತಕುಂಟೆಹಳ್ಳಿ, ಪಗೈರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹಾ ಅಕ್ಸ್ಟ್ರಾಲ್ ಪ್ರಾಪರ್ಟಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮೈಸೂರು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ದಾಖಲ್ಮಾದಿಕೊಂಡು ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಹುಟ್ಟುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್‌ಶೇಟರವರ ಯೋಗಾದಿನಂತೆಯೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಛತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯನೆರವೇರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಇದರಂತೆಯೆ ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಕಚೆಯಿದ್ದ ಲೇಟ್ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟರವರ ಸ್ಥಿರಸ್ವತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ದಾಖಲ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವಂತೆ ತಿಳಿಯಬರುತ್ತೆ.

(B) ಮೇಲೆ ಉದಹರಿಸಿರುವ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಮಾಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಾಸ್ಪದವಾದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸದರಿ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟರವರ ಭೂಸ್ವಿತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಸದರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ದಾಖಲ್ಮಾದಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅರ್ಹವಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ತ್ರಿಕರಣ ಶುದ್ಧಿಯಾಗಿಯೂ ದೇವರ ಕೈಂಕರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕೂಟ್ಟ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಂಥಾ ಧರ್ಮದಸ್ವತ್ತನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟು ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಫಲವತ್ತಾದ್ದನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದಿ ಮೂಲಕರ್ತರಾದ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟರವರ ಧರ್ಮವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಪಡಿಯಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಘನವನ್ನ ಹೊಂದಿದ ಮಹಾರಾಜರಾಜಾಸಾಹೇಬರವರ ಶ್ರೇಯಸ್ಸಾಂತಾಗಿರುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಚಿತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತೆ.

ನ್ಯಾಯ ತೀರ್ಪಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ.

ಚರ್ಚಾಸ್ಪದವಾದ ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ೩ ನೇ ಪ್ಯಾರಾದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗುವ. ಮ್ಯೂನಿಸಿಪಲ್ 491 ನೇ ನಂಬರು ನಿವೇಶನವು ಧರ್ಮಿಕಪರಾದ ಲೇಟ್ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ ಶೇರಿದ್ದಾದ್ದರಿಂದಾ ಸದರಿ ಶೇಟರಿಗೆ ವಾರಸ್ಸುದಾರರು ಇಲ್ಲದೆಯೂ, ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಭವಾನ್ ಸಾಹುಜಿಯು ಆತನಮಕ್ಕಳು ಸಾಹಕ್ಕುದಾರರಾದ್ದರಿಂದಲೂ ೨ ನೆಯವನಾದ ಗೌಡರ ವೀರ ಭದ್ರಪ್ಪನೆಂಬುವನು ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ರದ್ದಾದ ವಿಲ್‌ನಂತೆ ಉಸ್ತೆವಜು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಯಿರುವದು ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿರುವದ್ದರಿಂದಲೂ ಈಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿಷುರುಲಾಗಾಯ್ತು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಕಮಿಷ್ಟರವರ ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ, ಸಿಟಿ ಮ್ಯೂನಿಸಿಪಲ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಡಿದಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರ್ಯ ನಿಕಾರ್ಡುಗಳನ್ನು ತಿರಿಸಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಕೆಯಿಂದಾ ಸ್ವತ್ತನ್ನು ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಯಿಲಾಖಾ ಸುಪರ್ದಿಗೆ ತೆಗದುಕೊಂಡು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿನ ಧರ್ಮ ಘಂಡಿಸಿಂದಲೂ. ಬಕ್ತಾದಿಗಳಿಂದ ಘಂಡಾಘನೂಲ್ ಯಿಂದ ಯಿಷ್ಟ ಕಷ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿ ಅದರಿಂದಾ ಅತಿಥಿಗಳಾದ, ಶಿವ, ಮಾಧವರಗಳ ಪಡಿತರದೀಪಾರಾಧನೆ ಅರ್ಚಿಕಪೇತನ ಹುವ್ವಿನತೋಟದ ಆಳಿನ ಸಂಬಳಗಳನ್ನು ನಡಿಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಧರ್ಮಿಷ್ಟರಾದ ದಾಮೋದರದಾಸ್ ಶೇಟ್‌ರವರ ಧರ್ಮವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಜಿತ ಪಡಿಸಿ ಇಹಪರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾದ ಪುಣ್ಯಕೀರ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡಿಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ಭಕ್ತಿಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಈ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಗೌಡರ ವೀರಭದ್ರಪ್ಪನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿದ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟ ಬೈನೇಕನು ಸಡದು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವದ್ದರಿಂದಾ ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿ ನಿಮರ್ಸೆ ಆಗುವದರಿಗೂ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಂತೆ ಕೂಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಕ್ಕುಂ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಮಿಲಾಖೆಯವರಿಂದಾ ಸಾದರಾಗಿರುತ್ತೆಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ಕಿನವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಬಾಜುಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಧರ್ಮಸ್ಥರಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವಚನ.

ಶ್ರೀ ॥ ಅತ್ರಪಾಚ ಮಹಾಪಾಲೇಖಿವಿಷ್ಯದ । ಭೂಮಿಪಾಲ ॥ ತಿ
ಮಹಾಜಾಕರವಮಹಿಷಪ್ರಿವಂಶಜಾತಾ । ಮಹಾಮಾಪ್ರಕಾ
ಮಂಡಲಾಧಿಪಾಚಿತ್ರಾಣಿಯ ಸಾಮಾಸಾತಂಗಾ ಪಾಲಿಯಂ
ತಿ । ತಾಪ್ಪಾದುಕಾಪ್ಯಾಯಮಾಡ ॥ ಶ್ರೀ ॥

ಪಿ. ಈಶ್ವರಯ್ಯ.

Mallappa

Mlingadhalappa

ಸುಬಾಯ

ನಾರಾಯಣಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಮುದ್ರಾಯಂತ್ರ ಪ್ರಕಾಶ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು,—೧೯೨೫.

[illegible]

[illegible] 2302 [illegible]

[illegible] 16-1-0"

M. G. Ashwathanarayana

[illegible]

[illegible] led to

and others

[illegible] ference to

3633 of 21st

to the

[illegible] ga, praying

[illegible] of the Orders

[illegible] 2-3 of 19th

[illegible] ween

[illegible] sites of

in Chickapete,

[illegible] endowed

[illegible] te Kal Doss

temple,

a Muzrai institution at Balepet,

Bangalore city.

In reply, the petitioners are informed that no fresh grounds are urged by them for a reconsideration of the orders already passed. Their memorial is accordingly rejected.

By order

Dewan's Orders

4/6/05

Secy. Muzr. Dept.

No. 45445. of 6th June 05

Copy with Commr., Bangalore City, for info., in continn. of Govt. Pro: No 2302-3 of 19th Decr. 1904.

By order

4/6/05

Secy. Muzr. Dept.

[illegible]

Sri. Ashwathappa

[illegible]

16-1-05

M. Krishnasambao

ಪಿಲ್ಲರ್ ನಂಬರ್ ೪೦

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ತ್ರಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದಾ.

[illegible]

8/10

Endorsement: granted to Archak Varadachar and others of Bangalore, with reference to their memorial No. 3633 of 21st March 1905 addressed to His Highness the Maharaja, praying for a re-consideration of the orders passed in Govt. Pro: No. 2302-3 of 19th December 1904, rejecting their petition to recognize the sites of houses Nos: 26, 23 and 28 in Chickapete, Bangalore, as having been endowed by Damodar Doss Sait to the Lal Doss Venkataramanaswami temple, a Muzrai institution at Balepet, Bangalore city.

In reply, the petitioners are informed that no fresh grounds are urged by them for a reconsideration of the orders already passed. Their memorial is accordingly rejected.

By order
4/6/05
Secy. Mung: Dept.

Copy with Dy. Comm.r, Bangalore Dist., for info in continuation of Govt. Pro: No. 2302-3 of 19th Decr 1904.

By order
4/6/05
Secy. Mung Dept.

Dewan's Orders

4695

911

Presented in person
The petr wants a copy
of the petn of Varadachar
& the orders of Govt thereon.
Subtd for orders

17-6-05

Submd

The copies applied for may be granted

28/6/05

Sent copies
30/6/05

Submd

17-6-05

6/7/05

Refus
K.S.
3/9/06

1318

1521
K. 9. 16

[illegible]

[illegible] గారు శ్రీ [illegible]

[illegible] గారు [illegible]

[illegible] గారు [illegible]

[illegible] గారు [illegible]

[illegible] గారు [illegible] 1903 [illegible]

[illegible] 1906 [illegible]

3 [illegible] 1318 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

By Order,

4/9/06

Secretary

Mizoram Department

4/9/06

81 14

Muz 14]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

Dated 12/9/06

Despatched

Received

General No. 1654

Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

Referring to Govt. Pro. No. 2302-3 of the 19th Dec '04, has the honor to request that the Petition No 19519 of 25-5-03 from Varadachari in re the mismanagement of the endowments of the Sri Venkataramana Swami temple in Bangalore left by one Basappa, which seems to have been ~~been~~ sent to him ~~with the~~ while returning the Vernacular

CPB—3 000—22-7-06

records received with his letter No 16 of the 2nd Sept. '04, may kindly be caused to be retransmitted to this office at an early date

By order,

11/9/06

Secretary

8/9/06